# **FILED**

#### NOT FOR PUBLICATION

OCT 01 2007

### UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

CATHY A. CATTERSON, CLERK U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

## FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

MANJIT SINGH,

Petitioner,

v.

PETER D. KEISLER,\*\* Acting Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 06-72191

Agency No. A79-610-566

**MEMORANDUM**\*

On Petition for Review of an Order of the Board of Immigration Appeals

Submitted September 24, 2007\*\*\*

Before: CANBY, TASHIMA and RAWLINSON, Circuit Judges.

<sup>\*</sup> This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

<sup>\*\*</sup> Peter D. Keisler is substituted for his predecessor, Alberto R. Gonzales, as Acting Attorney General of the United States, pursuant to Fed. R. App. P. 43(c)(2).

This panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

Manjit Singh, a native and citizen of India, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' order affirming an Immigration Judge's ("IJ") denial of his applications for asylum, withholding of removal and relief under the Convention Against Torture ("CAT"). We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We deny the petition for review.

Substantial evidence supports the IJ's adverse credibility determination because Singh's testimony and asylum application are inconsistent with his asylum interview regarding the number of times he was arrested in India. *See Chebchoub v. INS*, 257 F.3d 1038, 1043 (9th Cir. 2001). Accordingly, Singh is not eligible for asylum.

Because Singh fails to establish eligibility for asylum, he also fails to demonstrate eligibility for withholding of removal. *See Farah v. Ashcroft*, 348 F.3d 1153, 1156 (9th Cir. 2003).

Finally, the record does not compel the conclusion that it is more likely than not that Singh will be tortured upon returning to India. *See Singh v. Gonzales*, 439 F.3d 1100, 1113 (9th Cir. 2006).

#### PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.